

From: Brent Dill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/23/02 2:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion, the Microsoft Antitrust settlement is greivously inadequate to redress Microsoft's demonstrated prior harm to the industry and economy, and does nothing to insure against further harm. Working in the IT field for the past 11 years, I have seen first-hand what Microsoft's artificial market dominance has wrought: poor quality of product, with no better choices ever coming to market, and those choices which already existed in the market have long since been driven out of business.

Microsoft now exists as the SOLE recourse for my industry, and it is woefully inadequate. A simple perusal of recent computer virus outbreaks demonstrates this - nearly every virus propogated in the past two years has done so as an exploit in Microsoft's operating systems and productivity tools. Worse, they are exploiting aspects of these tools that no reasonable piece of software should possess, and yet these softwares are not modified to remedy the threat.

Microsoft is willfully negligent in its duty, as a monopoly, to protect the consumers from the negative and inescapable effects of its decisions. If Microsoft is to have a 90% share of the computer desktop market, then Microsoft should be held 90% responsible for any problems that develop as a result of computer desktop software flaws. A proper injunction, at the very least, should allow peer or experct judicial review of Microsoft's production methods [i.e., their source code]. If Microsoft is allowed to continue their 90% stranglehold on the market, they should be forced to provide the market with a higher quality of service than the market would otherwise receive from competition.

Of course, the preferrable method would be to de-couple Microsoft's NT/XP kernel development from the rest of the corporation, allowing the resulting desktop/productivity development [the IE desktop/browser and the Office productivity suite] to be developed on multiple base operating system platforms. As both the Telephony industry and California's power grid have demonstrated, a government-regulated monopoly is seldom preferrable to a regulated free market.